Chapter 1

INTERTEXTUALITY: THEORY AND PRACTICE

1.1 The Concept of Intertextuality

The term “Intertextuality” is the English translation of the French word *L’intertextualité*. It was first used by the Bulgarian-French literary critic, psychoanalyst, feminist, and novelist Julia Kristeva in her 1960’s book *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Kristeva’s book was translated into English in 1980. She also uses the term in her critically acclaimed essay “The Bounded Text,” where she provides a definition of intertextuality. According to Kristeva, intertextuality (French *L’intertextualité*) is a feature of “any text [that] is constructed as a mosaic of quotations and also [involves] the absorption and transformation of another” (Juvan 11-12). The concept of intertextuality that she initiated reconceived the literary text as a dynamic site, in which relational processes and practices are the focus of analysis, instead of static structures and products, which were the concern of traditional criticism. The “literary word”, she writes in *Word, Dialogue, and Novel*, is “an intersection of textual surfaces, rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings” (65). Drawing upon the Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin’s formulations on the specialization of literary language, she argues, “each word (text) is an intersection of other words (texts), where at least one other word (text) can be read” (*Word, Dialogue, and Novel* 66). There are always other words in a word, other texts in a text. The concept of intertextuality requires, therefore, that we understand texts not as self-contained systems, but as differential and historical, as traces and tracings of otherness, since these are
shaped by the repetition and transformation of other textual structures. Rejecting the New Critical principle of textual autonomy, the theory of intertextuality insists that a text cannot exist as a self-sufficient whole, and therefore as a corollary, that it does not function as a closed system. Thus, the theoretical paradigm of intertextuality serves as an impetus to the expansiveness of the text.

From this initial re-definition of textuality, a wide range of attitudes have emerged towards the concept of intertextuality and what it implies, to such an extent that it is practically impossible to deal with it, without considering other related subjects, or without taking into account the various contributions made by a large number of literary critics. In other words, the plethora of concerns surrounding the idea is prolific in character. One of the most immediate consequences of such a production of intertextual theories has been the progressive dissolution of the text as a coherent and self-contained unit of meaning. This has, in turn, led to a shift of emphasis from the individual text to the way in which texts relate to one another.

The phenomenon of intertextuality, in one form or the other, is at least as old as recorded human society (Worton and Still, *Intertextuality: theories and Practices*, 2). Unsurprisingly, therefore, we can find theories of intertextuality wherever there has been discourse about texts, from the classics of the writers of Graeco-Roman antiquity, such as Plato, Aristotle, Longinus, and Horace, to the theorists of the twentieth-century, including Mikhail Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva, Gerard Genette, Roland Barthes, Michael Riffaterre, and Jacques Derrida, among others. Julia Kristeva studied Ferdinand de Saussure and Michael Bakhtin’s works and combined the language and literature of both the theorists. Such a blend of ideas and idiom has given birth to the new term
“intertextuality.” Such neologisms indicate a transition period as far as views on text and textuality are considered. The transition of the above-described kind is described in terms of a move from structuralism to poststructuralism (Allen 3). Conceptually, a transition implies move, change, or transformation from one set of ideas to another. Indeed, critical history has witnessed a move from structuralism to poststructuralism. Graham Allen describes this move as “one in which assertions of scientific rigour, objectivity, methodological stability and other highly rationalistic-sounding terms are replaced by an emphasis on improbability, incommunicability, indeterminacy, desire, subjectivity, pleasure and play” (Allen, 3). The concept of intertextuality has greater ramifications than textual analysis. According to Allen, intertextuality is a useful term which foregrounds the notion of relationality, interdependence, and interconnections in modern culture.

There are different ways in which intertextuality can be used by a writer and critic. Intertextuality shows the relationship between different texts of different authors. It also shows the relationship between texts by the same author. It can be found in a single writer’s works, or a series of works. As said earlier, the field of study is marked by a proliferating and diverse views on its subject. Different authors have widely different opinions on intertextuality. According to Julia Kristeva, all texts are intertexts, and intertextuality is how a text’s very meaning is shaped by other texts. Intertextuality is a transformation of, or rewriting of the pre-existent texts. In the introductory part of his book *Intertextuality*, Graham Allen says:

The idea that when we read a work of literature, we are seeking to find a meaning which lies inside that work seems completely commonsensical. Literary texts
possess meaning and readers extract that meaning from them. We call process of extracting meaning from texts reading or interpretation. Works of literature, after all, are built from systems, codes and traditions established by previous works of literature. The systems, codes and traditions of art forms and of culture in general are also crucial to the meaning of a work of literature. Texts, whether literary or non-literary, are viewed by modern theorists as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call “intertextual”. The act of reading plunges us into a network of textual relations. To interpret a text, to discover its meaning, or meanings, is to trace those relations. Reading, thus, becomes a process of moving between texts. Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text into a network of textual relations. The text, then, becomes intertext. (1)

Julia Kristeva, in her work “Revolution in Poetic Language Style,” depicts intertextuality as a third procedure within the semiotic process. Kristeva’s semiotic approach seeks to study the literary text as a textual arrangement of elements which possess double meanings within the text itself and a meaning in what she calls “historical and social text” (Allen, Intertextuality, 37). Such a kind of approach blows away the distinct notion of inside and outside with regard to the text. The theory of intertextuality is reintroduced several times in her work. The theory of intertextuality maintains that any text cannot exist on its own. Intertextuality is nothing but presenting the past things in the present. Since every text is the pre-text of something, there is bound to be some kind of connection between, or among, the different texts. It can be imitation, transformation, or
influence of other texts. No text is unique or can exist on its own. Every text represents an absorption and transformation of other texts.

Michael Riffaterre

According to Michael Riffaterre, literary texts are not referential. These have meaning, because the semiotic structure links up their individual words, phrases, sentences, key images, themes, and rhetoric. Riffaterre claims that a text refers to other texts, and signs refer to other signs (Allen, *Intertextuality* 115). It produces its significance out of transformation of socially normative discourse, which he calls the “sociolect” (Allen, *Intertextuality*, 119). In consideration of the appropriate role of the reader, Riffaterre approaches intertextuality not only from the point of view of all the possible relations among texts, but as the main, fundamental characteristic of (literary) reading. He describes the literary phenomenon as not only the text, but also its reader and all the reader’s possible reactions to the text (Riffaterre, *Text Production*, 3). As we shall see later, such a dynamic notion of the text in relation to the reader has a bearing on intertextual readings which concretize potential reciprocal relations with previous texts.

Although Riffaterre has sometimes been called a structuralist, this label needs qualification, for he rejects the structuralist search for a deep grammar in literature, as well as the notion that all literary works of a given type share the same structure. On the contrary, he believes that the only significant structure in a literary work is that which the reader can recognize. Yet, he must also be distinguished from the reader-response critics, in that his work is based on a concern with textual elements that readers are *obliged* to recognize and factor in their readings. Riffaterre divides the process of reading into two
One of these is a naive, “mimetic” reading, which yields, what he calls, the “meaning” of a work, the linear, word-by-word decoding of the message, in accordance with an assumption that the language used is referential, and that words relate directly to things. In the course of this reading, however, one encounters “ungrammaticalities” – obscurities, difficulties, undecidable moments, figurative language, any wording so unacceptable in a mimetic context that it prompts the reader to look elsewhere for the “significance” of the work. This emerges only in a second stage of reading, which is no longer linear but comparative. Riffaterre considers two possible, though not exclusive, ways of reading comparatively: retroactive reading and intertextual reading. The former refers to the way in which the reader keeps reviewing and comparing backwards, recognizing repetitions and variations upon the same structures of intertextual reading; on the other hand is the awareness of similar comparabilities from text to text; or it is the supposition that such comparing must be done, even if there is no intertext at hand, wherein to find comparabilities (Riffaterre, Syllepsis, Critical Inquiry, 626):

Ambiguity exists only as a stage in the reading process and serves to alert the reader to the presence of an intertext that will resolve the work’s difficulties. These function as traces left by the absent intertext, as signs of an intertext to be completed elsewhere. Such “clues” are enough to set in train an intertextual reading, even if the intertext is not yet known, or has been lost with the tradition it reflected. (Riffaterre 627)

Rejecting the poststructuralist dispersal of meanings, Riffaterre claims that there is only one correct reading, and that it is the intertextual method that guides the reader in his
or her act of interpretation. According to him, the ability to recognize gaps and ungrammaticalities are part of every reader’s linguistic competence, and it does not require much erudition or “preternatural insights” (1987, 373). Yet his own interpretations of poems and novels are full of learned allusions and draw on his encyclopedic command of French and English literatures. Anyway, what is relevant in his theory is his basic concern with the effect on the reader of a textual presupposition: readers presuppose that there is an intertext which gives structural and semantic unity to the work. However, the success or failure to locate that intertext on the part of the reader is, in a sense, irrelevant to the experience of intertextual reading. Analogous, if not identical, with Kristeva’s assertion that every text is under the jurisdiction of other discourses, Riffaterre’s thesis is that literary reading is possible only if the reader recognizes that the text articulates a presupposition of intertext, to such an extent that the text can be considered not simply a sequence of words organized as syntagms, but a sequence of presuppositions (1980, 627).

Jonathan Culler

The concept of presupposition is one of the theory of Jonathan Culler. The example of Riffaterre illustrates the logical independence of intertextuality from many poststructuralist assumptions. Culler also argues for the constraining power of intertextuality, there is only one proper understanding of a text, the one that is reached through the intertextual method. In his essay “Presupposition and Intertextuality” (1976), Culler suggests that we start the study of intertextuality, by considering its linguistic dimensions and in terms of two kinds of presuppositions: logical and pragmatic. The
former are best thought of as the presuppositions of a sentence. Thus, the question “Have you stopped beating your wife?” presupposes that one previously was in the habit of beating one’s wife (Culler, 1976, 1389). On the other hand, a sentence like “Once upon a time”, though poor in logical presuppositions, is extremely rich in pragmatic ones, since it relates the story that follows to a series of other stories, and identifies it with the conventions of a genre (Culler, 1976, 1392). The linguistic analogy suggests, according to Culler, two ways of approaching intertextuality:

The first is to look at the specific presuppositions of a given text, the way in which it produces a pre-text, an intertextual space whose occupants may or may not correspond to other actual texts. The second enterprise, the study of rhetorical or pragmatic presupposition, leads to a poetics which is less interested in the occupants of that intertextual space, which makes a work intelligible than in the conventions which underlie that discursive activity or space. (1976, 1395)

The practical virtue of Culler’s proposal is that it limits the set of possible intertexts to those which are either logically or pragmatically suggested by the work one is studying, and that it does so without excluding the anonymous, already read discourse of the social text, which is usually ignored in influence studies (Culler, 1976,1383). From this point of view, Culler also calls attention to the complex quality of the relationship that exists between influence and intertextuality. When he proposes to follow the linguistic model (and, in particular, the notion of presupposition), he does so as a means of avoiding the danger of setting out to study intertextuality and focusing, in the end, on a text’s relation to specific precursors, something more in consonance with influence studies. It is such precursor-relationships that we find in the intertextual dynamics of The
Leatherstocking Tales. According to Culler, this is precisely the sort of mistake that Kristeva makes in her analysis of Lautreamont’s Poesies, a disappointing reading for anyone under the impression that the whole point of intertextuality is to take us beyond the study of identifiable sources (Culler, 1976, 1384-85). Indeed intertextuality is a more dynamic concept than traditional source-studies.

It [the text] is the fabric of the words which make up the work and which are arranged in such a way to impose a meaning which is stable as far as possible unique. In spite of the partial and modest character of the notion (it is after all, only an object, perceptible to the visual sense), it is the prosaic, but necessary, servant… the text is, in the work, what secures the guarantee of the written text.

(Allen, Intertextuality 62)

Earlier, that is, prior to the poststructuralist turn, Roland Barthes was a structuralist. From his poststructuralist perspective, the „text” (derived from the Latin word texere, which means to weave; the word text is the past participle form of the verb, and means woven) is a fabric of the words which make up the work and which are arranged in such a way as to impose a meaning which is stable, and, as far as possible, unique. Barthes observes that the reader cannot fully stabilize the meaning of a literary text. The intertextual nature of a work leads the reader to the new textual relations, so that the author cannot be responsible for multiple meanings. True to the typical poststructuralist position, he observes that nothing exists outside the text, and meaning is always interior and invariably deferred. Meaning occurs in a text because of the play of the signifier – not because of the one signified.
Starting with Plato, it must be said that, in spite of his resistance to poetry on moral, and hence political, grounds, certain aspects of his theory have much in common with some modern approaches to intertextuality. Bakhtin himself locates in the Socratic dialogues one of the earliest forms of what he terms variously the novel, heteroglossia, dialogism – what Kristeva will christen as intertextuality. The dialogues, Plato’s typical creation, are usually meandering and inconclusive discussions, lacking overall unity and characterized by their digressive and playful tone. There is ambivalence not only in the variety of ideologies evoked, but also in the central figure of Socrates, the intelligent fool, sometimes sensitive or loving, sometimes ironic or even savagely satirical. This serious truth-seeking by means of a plurality of voices obviously recalls what Bakhtin will celebrate in the dialogic novel – the multiplicity and cross-fertilization of voices and viewpoints. In addition to the structure of the Socratic dialogue, intertextual relations are highlighted in other aspects of Plato’s theory, such as his notion of texts as subliminal purveyors of ideology that can influence and alter the subject, as well as in his view of imitation. Neither Platonic nor Aristotelian imitation is to be understood as imitation of nature. Though Bakhtin and Kristeva saw Aristotelian logic as related to the monologic pole of discourse, due to its emphasis on unified and universal truths, the later critics have argued that the Aristotelian account of composition, as drawing from a variety of sources, can be considered close to the notions of polyphony and dialogism (Worton and Still, *Intertextuality: Theory Practice*, 1990, 4).

For Bakhtin, unity, or plenitude, in language can only be an illusion. Literary authors can attempt artificially to strip language of others’ intentions, a unifying project, which he calls monologism or poetry. On the other hand, at certain historical moments, writers
have artistically elaborated and intensified heteroglossia, creating what he calls the dialogic novel. As (Worton, Michael & Still Judith 15) point out, it is important to note that these categories do not correspond to traditional ones.

According to (Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays, 271), monologism has been encouraged or imposed by hierarchical or centralizing socio-linguistic forces, for example, Aristotelian or Cartesian poetics, the medieval church’s “one language of truth”, or Saussurean linguistics. The novel, on the other hand, has been shaped by iconoclastic, even revolutionary, popular traditions, among which, the carnival has been playing a very important role. It is in popular laughter, in the parody and travesty of all high genres and lofty models that the roots of the novel are to be sought. This applies, in particular, to the Socratic dialogues and also to Menippean satire, in which laughter is used as a weapon against authority and the established hierarchies. Whereas the epic world, and the world of high literature, in general, is absolute and complete, closed as a circle inside which everything is past and already over, low genres and, in a broad sense, the common people’s creative culture of laughter deal with contemporaneity, flowing, transitory, “low”, present (Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays, 20). Under such an influence, the novel appears as unique among all genres, due to its ability to change and develop. Moreover, every time the novel, in any of its manifestations, has tried to adopt and keep a stable, fixed form, it has been heavily attacked and criticised (Bakhtin, 1981, 6). This is what happened, for instance, with the good-manners romance and the sentimental novel. However, it is from the parody of previous novelistic traditions that some of the most important works in the history of literature have taken their shape. From
this perspective, nothing conclusive can be said about the novel, which must always be seen as open, free, and in a state of continuous development.

The other point this researcher would like to comment on goes back to what has already been said about the novel’s link with the present, a present which is always changing and moving towards an equally inconclusive future. In spite of this, the novel can have, and often has, the past as its central subject. But even when this is the case, the present and its open character will always be the basis on which the portrait of the past is structured. According to Afda Dfaz Bild (1994, 140), this direct contact with contemporary reality has important consequences for the novelistic discourse. One of these has to do with the author’s ability to move freely within his or her field of representation (something unthinkable in the case of the epic), which makes possible the introduction of one of the novel’s basic features: its literary self-consciousness. In addition, this new temporal orientation puts it in contact with extra-literary genres, that is, with everyday reality and quotidian ideology. This fact enhances even more the open quality of the novel, since literary evolution brings with it not only the introduction of changes within existing limits, but also the modification of such limits. After all, the boundaries between fiction and non-fiction, between literature and non-literature, and so forth, are not laid up in Heaven (Bakhtin, 1981, 33).

According to Bakhtin, everything stands under the same sign: the sign of plurality. Our lives are surrounded by the echoes of a dialogue that undermines the authority of any single voice, a dialogue that takes place within the text, but which is, at the same time, a dialogue with all the voices outside it. Unlike the third eye of Tibetan Buddhism, which gives those who possess it a vision of the secret unity holding creation together, Bakhtin...
seems to have had a third ear that permitted him to hear differences, where others perceived only sameness, especially in the apparent wholeness of the human voice (Holquist, 1983, 307).

Using a different theoretical framework and a markedly various idiom, Harold Bloom argues that all the poets are doing the same thing, instead of creating a fresh literary work. The Freudian terminology, which Bloom adapts, is concerned with the desire to imitate, as also the desire to be original. Bloom states that poets employ the central figures of previous poetry, but they transform, redirect, and reinterpret figures with those already written in novel ways or in new styles. All texts are intertexts, which are also called the source of study, or source texts; and intertextuality, for him, is a product of what he calls “the anxiety of influence.”

Gerard Genette and His Open-Structuralist Approach

Gerard Genette was one of the structuralists. He was a French theorist and critic. Genette took a structural approach to intertextuality. He talks about the ways in which the signs and texts work within an open system and are generated by describable systems, cultural practices, codes, and rituals. Genette concentrated in the major part of his studies on the nature of the narrative discourse, and especially on narrative fiction. In his celebrated trilogy of theoretical works he discusses palimpsests, the architexts, and paratexts. Genette formed a coherent theory and critical map of what he termed as transtextuality. His map of relations between texts represents a structural approach to intertextuality. The re-description of the entire field of poetics from a new perspective is called transtextuality, which works as an umbrella term for all types of textual relations,
or textual transcendence, which includes elements of imitation, transformation, and the classification of types of discourse. Genette uses the concept of transtextuality in such a way as to show how a text can be systematically interpreted and understood in terms of relations between and among various kinds of texts. He subdivided the term transtextuality into five types: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality. According to Genette, intertextuality is, however, a relationship of co-presence between texts or among several texts and the actual presence of one text within another (Allen, *Intertextuality* 101). Genette’s intertextuality consists of quotation and allusion, which are micro-level intertextual relations, which also influences the making of meaning in the act of reading.

Gerard Genette’s approach to the subject of intertextuality can be considered as an attempt to delimit the definitions of intertextuality proposed in its prolific character by Kristeva, Derrida, Barthes, and others, as they have been found difficult to apply to the practical analysis of literary texts. Genette concentrated basically on the literary text in the strict sense of the word. Reading Kristeva’s notion of intertextuality as referring to the literal and effective presence in a text of another text, he asserted that intertextuality is an inadequate term, and comprehensively proposed in its place transtextuality, by which he meant everything, be it explicit or latent, that relates one text to others. Therefore, though he centered his ideas on the particular literary text, he acknowledged that it can no longer be studied in isolation:

El objeto de la poetica [...] no es el texto considerado en su singularidad [...] sino el architexto... Hoy yo diria, en un sentido ms amplio, que este objeto es la transtextualidad o la transcendencia textual del texto. (1989, 9)
The object of the poetics [ ... ] is not the text considered in its singularity [ ... ] but the archtext ... Today I would say, in a broad sense ms, that this object is transtextuality or textual transcendence text. (1989, 9)

In *Palimpsests*, his “last word” upon intertextuality, Genette persists on the global character of the notion of transtextuality, and offered the following subcategories (1989, 10-15):

1. **Intertextuality**: This term denotes the relation of co-presence between two or more texts, that is, the effective presence of one text in another, which takes place by means of plagiarism, quotation, or allusion.

2. **Paratextuality**: By this term, Genette refers to the relations between the body of a text and its title, subtitle, epigraphs, Illustrations, notes, first drafts, and other kinds of accessory signals which surround the text. According to Genette, paratext performs various functions which direct the text’s reader and can be understood pragmatically in terms of the manner of the text’s existence. The term “paratextuality” indicates elements such as the purpose of the text and intention of the text (Allen 104). A paratext is what enables the text to become a book. The paratext consists of peritext and epitext. The peritext includes elements such as titles, chapter titles, prefaces, captions, and notes. It also encompasses dedications, illustrations, epigraphs. The epitext consists of elements such as interviews, publicity announcements and reviews, as well as authorial and editorial discourse. Thus, the paratext is the sum of the peritext and the epitext. The paratext helps the reader to know about the text’s threshold, which has
different elements, including the title, chapter, and even the design of the cover, and can help the reader understand a text quite easily. It helps the reader to know various elements about a text; for example, the text’s author, when it was published, and so on. Paratextual elements can direct the readers in multiple ways, and similarly organize their understanding and interpretation of the text. The prefix “para” implies both sides, inside and outside. The paratext performs several functions which lead and guide the reader of the text. Though it helps us to understand a text, we cannot define a text’s meaning clearly, unless and until we read it out. It can help make guesses about a text, but we cannot define how the different elements work. Sometimes they serve as comments on the text.

3. **Metatextuality:** The term “metatextuality” indicates the relation, usually called “commentary”, which links one text with another that comments on it, without quoting it, or even without mentioning it at all. It is the critical relation *par excellence*.

4. **Architextuality:** This term refers to the generic category to which a text belongs. The text may not recognise its generic quality, which should be decided by its readers, critics, and others who engage the individual text. However, this generic perception determines, to a large extent, the reader’s “horizons of expectations”, and, therefore, the work’s reception.

5. **Hypertextuality:** The next term in Genette’s critical repertoire, hypertextuality, denotes the relation between the late-come text (*hypertext*) and its pre-text (*hypotext*). He defines hypertext as every text derived from a previous one by means of direct or indirect transformation (imitation, but not through commentary).
In the former, a case of direct or simple transformation, a text „B“ may make no explicit reference to a previous one, text „A“, but it could not exist without „A“. For instance, Virgil’s *The Aeneid* and James Joyce’s *Ulysses* are, in different degrees, two hypertexts of the same hypertext, Homer’s *The Odyssey*. Imitation is a more complex kind of transformation since it requires the constitution of a *generic* model.

In spite of this complex and detailed classification, the five sub-categories suggested by Genette tend to go beyond, when it comes to actual literary and critical practice. For example, the paratext may also contribute to determining the generic quality of the text, thus merging with architextuality. Hypertextuality, seen as the presence of one text in another text, does not seem to be very different from intertextuality. Only by restricting the latter notion to plagiarism, quotation, or allusion, and the former to parody, travesty, and pastiche, is he able to keep these apart. However, both categories fall together again when he acknowledges that:

> no hay obra literaria que, en algun grado y segun las lecturas, no evoque otra, y, en este sentido, todas las obras son hipertextuales ... (1989, 19)

> no literaria work , and according to some degree readings not evoke another , and in this sense , all works are hypertextual ... (1989 , 19)

In such a general statement as this, one could equally use the term “intertextual” instead of “hypertextual”.

Despite the complex terminology and the unavoidable overlapping, Genette’s concepts may be taken as a useful point of departure to be sufficiently defined later on by each individual critic or theorist. Above all, these terminological classifications contribute to underlining the complexity of the notion of intertextuality. Each text is
trapped in a network of relations, between the different parts that constitute it, between a particular text and those which precede it. All those relations can be said to survive in so far as these are apparent by the reader, who may discover an echo, but may equally silence it. Genette himself goes so far as to declare that the hypertext inevitably gains in some way or another from the reader’s knowledge of its signifying and determining relationships with its hypotexts (1989, 494), thus confirming Linda Hutcheon’s assertion that most discussions of intertextuality end up considering the role of the reader, no matter how formalistic they have attempted to sound (Hutcheon 1986, 232). As Worton and Still (1990, 23) point out, Genette’s analysis of individual texts may be less sustained, less close than Riffaterre’s, but his work does insistently remind us that memory can be actively revolutionary only so long as it is creative as well as commemorative.

The third type of approach, that of putting intertextuality at the service of political and historical projects, has become identified with two schools, Rezeptions-Ästhetik (Reception Aesthetic), and critics associated with Michel Foucault. The former has tried to chart historical development by looking at the ways in which the intertextual connections that a text evokes and change over time. Its leading proponents, Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, do not rely extensively on the term intertextuality, but their investigations into continuity and change employ very related notions. For Clayton and Mitchell Rothstein (1991, 26), Jauss’s Gadamerian notion of “horizon of expectations” that a reader brings to a work resembles intertextuality. This is because the reader’s horizon is constructed by an inherited system of norms and conventions. To the study of this intertextual field, Jauss’ reception criticism adds a historical dimension, by tracing
the ways in which different readers’ horizons diverge from one another over time. As far as Iser’s reader-response criticism is concerned, it employs a similar intertextual concept, the notion of the “repertoire of the text”, a repertoire that exists only in the reader’s consciousness and is activated by references to earlier works, or to social and historical norms, or even to the whole culture from which the text has emerged (in Clayton and Mitchell, Rothstein, 1991, 26).

Foucault’s thoughts on the subject lead towards a conception of intertextuality that emphasise the role played not only by discursive, but also by non-discursive formations, such as institutions, professions, and disciplines. Of course, Foucault’s focus is on the historical dynamics of power and restrictive discourses. Unlike Barthes and Derrick, with their boundlessly creative visions of textuality, Foucault highlights the forces that restrict the free circulation of the text. Among these, he cites the author principle, that of commentary and that of discipline:

We tend to see, in an author’s fertility, in the multiplicity of commentaries and in the development of a discipline so many infinite resources available for the creation of discourse. Perhaps so, but these are, nonetheless, principles of constraint, and it is probably impossible to appreciate their positive, multiplicative role, without first taking into consideration their restrictive, constraining role. (Foucault, 1972, 224)

To these principles of limitation, Foucault also adds the circumstances under which discourses may be employed. Although every text possesses innumerable points of relationship with other texts, these relations situate a work within the existing networks of power, at the same time creating and disciplining the text’s ability to signify. Foucault
insists that we analyze the role of power in the production of textuality and of textuality in the production of power. This entails looking closely at those social and political institutions by which subjects are subjected, enabled, and regulated in forming textual meanings. Even if he regards the text as a site of “anonymity” and the author as a “role function” played out in the text, Foucault does not agree with Barthes’s isolation of the text from history and ideology. His concept of culture as intersecting discourses represents a form of the concept of intertextuality that emphasizes the production of ideology.

The Concept of Interfigurality

Interfigurality is one of the types of intertextuality. The term “Interfigurality” refers to the relationship between literary characters. The interrelations that exist between characters of different texts represent one of the most important dimensions of intertextuality, and catches the attention of the reader more immediately than any other textual dimension. Theodore Ziolkowski discusses a special form of interfigurality, namely, the transfer of a figure from one fictional work to another, for which phenomenon he coined the term *figure on loan*. This phrase denotes the transformation of the characters, or names, from one text to the other in its identical, or a changed form. This interesting phenomenon in its linguistic aspects is comparable to a quotation. Like a quotation, a re-used name “repeats a segment derived from a pretext within a subsequent text” (Plett 295), and just as in a quotation, the segment, taken over from the anterior, is subjected to alteration or transformation in the posterior text. One of the most prominent meaning-generating mechanisms in literary name-giving is the linking of the name of a
literary figure to the name of an earlier literary figure. Identity, or partial identity, of names from different literary works is always an interfigural element. Changes in the figure of an author’s works may be due to the new intention or aesthetic vision of the author.

1.3 The Series-Novel Genre

The series-novel genre is a literary genre in which the writer can reiterate the characters of the anterior text to the posterior text by means of alteration and transformation of the characters. A typical example is John Galsworthy’s The Forsyte Saga. Galsworthy’s work consists of a series of three novels – *The Man of Property*, *In Chancery*, and *To Let* – and two interludes – *Indian Summer of a Forsyte* and *Awakening* – published between 1906 and 1921. James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Leatherstocking Tales*, which forms the focus of my research, consists of five novels. In this series, he re-uses the protagonist several times. Cooper alters the protagonist in each novel in the series. *The Pioneers* is the first novel of the series in which the protagonist is in his old age, and in order to continue the genre, Cooper alters the protagonist (Natty Bumppo) in *The Last of the Mohicans* into a young man, and chooses the situation and fictionalizes the history of America which occurs earlier in *The Pioneers* as well. *The Prairie* is the third novel in order of the publication, but chronologically it is the last novel in the series, that is, according to the age of the protagonist. The remaining two novels, *The Pathfinder* and *The Deerslayer*, were set prior to *The Last of the Mohicans* and after *The Last of the Mohicans*, respectively.
1.4 Conceptualizing Intertextuality in the Series-Novel Genre

Intertextuality can be conceptualized by comprehending the relationship between what Gerard Genette calls the hypotext (A) and the hypertext (B). In general, in the series-novel genre, the hypotext discusses the pre-condition of the protagonist. In comparison with the hypertext it is the reader’s role to analyze and investigate the continuity and changes in the texts, for instance, changes in the characters such as age, manners, setting, plot, and so on. In Cooper’s *The Leatherstocking Tales* the figure of Natty Bumppo is considerably changed all through the series. In what appears to be a randomly written series, the character of Natty Bumppo is altered in each novel.

Natty Bumppo appears first in *The Pioneers*, in which he is in his old age. He believes in nature and the god of nature. In this novel he follows the formula “Use but do not waste”. According to Bumppo, “the best piece of work that I’ve met with in the woods; and none know how often the hand of God is seen in the wilderness, but them that rove it for a man's life”. To say that Natty Bumppo belongs to a pre-agrarian world is to understate the case. He is a character whose vision dates from creation, whose experience remains proximate to a beginning world unmediated by history. In this protagonist of his, it may be claimed, Cooper presents the primal version of human nature. Natty Bumppo’s motive for leaving Templeton is to realign himself with “beginnings,” which in *The Leatherstocking Tales* characteristically take the form of an un-spoiled American wilderness. As he explains to Oliver and Elizabeth, “The meanest of God’s creates be made for some use, and I’m formed for the wilderness; if ye love me, let me go where my soul craves to be ag’ in!” (ch 26).
Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans* is the second novel in the series in which Natty is an adult. *The Prairie* is the third novel in the series. This novel is about Natty’s old age. The aged Natty Bumppo tells Paul Hover that if he could choose his “time and place again” he would speak for “twenty and the wilderness” (Cooper, *The Prairie* 32). My contention is that this statement of the protagonist self-reflexively points to the temporal transformations which the author works in his protagonist as well as to the movement of history which plays itself out through him. After thirteen years, Cooper returns to the figure of *The Leatherstocking Tales* by way of a network of social distinctions. And to anticipate the complex demands of closure he presents a Natty Bumppo who grows dramatically older and younger in the course of the narrative. Cooper has explicitly stated his intention of resurrecting the protagonist. On the basis of public response, Cooper includes two more novels in the series; they are *The Pathfinder* and *The Deerslayer*. In *The Pathfinder* the protagonist is an adult, and, interestingly, deferent in his thoughts. He wants to put a full stop to his bachelor life, and get married to Mabel. He is in love with Mable. In a similar vein, Cooper’s last novel *The Deerslayer* “suggests a time before history” Repeatedly, Cooper speaks of a wilderness “untouched by the hands of man,” and his narrative voice continues to be of an indistinguishable substance from that of Natty Bumppo. I shall discuss the intertextual nature of such inter-fictional transformations and engagements in the following chapter, which is entitled “Cooper’s Intertextual Art.”